

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

BOB BURRELL, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Civ. No. 98-438 JC/WWD

LEONARD ARMIJO, et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court as the result of a Rule 16 telephone conference held on July 7, 1998. Defendants have granted several extensions of time to Plaintiffs to respond to Defendants' motions to dismiss and Defendants' motion to strike. Defendants have also served on Plaintiffs a motion to stay discovery. After discussing the matter with the parties, I determined that Plaintiffs should be given one more extension in which to respond to the motions to dismiss and the motion to strike. Because of the nature of the motions to dismiss, I felt that the motion to stay discovery was well taken, and that it should be granted. Under the circumstances, it will not be necessary to file the motion to stay discovery.

WHEREFORE,

IT IS ORDERED that on or before July 15, 1998, Plaintiffs shall serve on Defendants their responses to Defendants' motions to dismiss and Defendants' motion to strike.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that on or before August 7, 1998, Defendants shall serve on Plaintiffs any replies in connection with the aforementioned motions.

FINALLY, IT IS ORDERED that discovery in this cause shall be stayed pending the ruling on Defendants' motions to dismiss.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE